

APPENDIX M

ARFF STUDY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Greiner

E100387.00

October 11, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Files

FROM: Mike Kenney

SUBJECT: **ADOT/ARFF Training Facility Committee
Meeting Minutes**

On this day, a meeting of this committee was held in Phoenix in conjunction with the AzAA Conference at the Orange Tree Resort. A list of attendees follows and the essential elements of the meeting are summarized below:

Attendees:

Larry Larkin, Flagstaff	Bill Critchfied, FAA
Mike Covalt, Grand Canyon	Bill Harvey, ADOT
Ted Swendra, Lake Havasu	Mike Kenney, Greiner
Barkley Dick, Tucson	Randall Beck, Greiner
George Michael, Sierra Vista	Jim Cook, Greiner
Carl Newman, Sky Harbor	

Summary

The purposes of the meeting were to (1) give the Committee members information on the proposed City of Phoenix Fire Department site, (2) permit Committee members to use the Site Evaluation Matrix to evaluate the proposed ARFF sites and (3) present information on the British-designed ARFF training facilities.

1. **City of Phoenix Fire Department Emergency Services Institute (ESI)**

- Mr. Kenney, Mr. Beck and Mr. Cook gave an overview of the ESI site based on recent site visits and interviews. Maps, photographs and a

video were provided as visual aids along with the October 2nd written proposal from the Department.

- A concern was raised regarding any potential conflicts between this site and the new third runway at Sky Harbor.
- The close proximity of the site to downtown Phoenix was also discussed.

2. Site Evaluation

- Mr. Kenney gave an overview of all eight potential ARFF sites under consideration. These included Evergreen, Holbrook, Kingman, Prescott, Tucson, Phoenix, Williams/Gateway and Yuma.
- All six Committee members present used the Site Evaluation Matrix to assess the proposed Phoenix site. Four of the members present at the August 4th meeting were given their original evaluation materials for reference; two members that were not present at the August 4th meeting were asked to assess all eight sites at this time.
- Committee members were not informed of the final results of the evaluation, but it was announced later at the AzAA conference that Tucson, Phoenix, and Williams/Gateway (not necessarily in that order) were ranked among the top three.

3. British ARFF Training Facility Concept

- Mr. Kenney gave an overview of the Imperial Fire Devices ARFF training facilities he visited recently in Great Britain. Photographs, a video and promotional materials were provided.
- Several attributes of this equipment include fuel conservation, reduced smoke, realistic mock-ups and comparatively lower costs. These facilities are fueled with JP-4 or diesel and have been used successfully throughout Great Britain for over 10 years.

- Taking into consideration the Committee's August 4th recommendation to use conventional fuels for the aircraft mockup trainer, further consideration was given to the British concept. After some discussion, it was unanimously decided to recommend that this concept be adopted into the ADOT/ARFF plan.

End of Meeting

MK:ha

xc: Attendees

Greiner

August 8, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Attendees

FROM: Mike Kenney 

SUBJECT: ADOT/ARFF Training Facility Committee Meeting Minutes

On August 4, 1995, a meeting of this committee was held at Flagstaff Airport. A copy of the Agenda is attached, a list of the attendees follows and the essential elements of the meeting are summarized below:

Attendees:

Larry Larkin, Committee Chair
George Michael, Sierra Vista
Dave Gaines, Yuma
Barkley Dick, Tucson
Bob Nichols, Page

Mike Kenney, Greiner
Randall Beck, Greiner
Jim Cook, Greiner
Bill Harvey, ADOT
John Vincent, Sky Harbor

Summary

I. Introduction

Mr. Larkin discussed the purpose of the Committee, the purpose of the meeting and the proposed meeting schedule (see Agenda attached).

II. Schedule

Mr. Kenney discussed the 12-month schedule.

III. Background

Mr. Kenney gave an overview of the First and Second Draft Reports which addressed Tasks 1 through 5 and 6 through 8, respectively.

Mr. Kenney gave an overview of the Public Meeting held at Williams/Gateway Airport in April, 1995.

Mr. Kenney gave an overview of the Third Draft Report (Financial Feasibility Study - Task 9) which was published in June.

Mr. Kenney gave an overview of the ARFF Training Facility Symposon held in Dallas on July 28th and 29th.

IV. Today's Goals

A. Facility Demand - The Committee was posed with the following question: Should this Committee recommend that a Regional ARFF Training Facility be built in the State of Arizona? After much discussion, the committee answered unanimously in the affirmative, with the following suggestions/comments:

- Consider the "regional" benefit to potential out-of-state users when looking at FAA Discretionary Funds.
- Consider the benefit to non-airport fire fighters that need ARFF training.
- Consider the potential benefit to ARFF personnel when training at a facility that also offers other (non-ARFF) training.
- Consider other benefactors of ARFF training, such as airlines, as potential financial contributors.
- Need a "pool" of users that includes both aviation and non-aviation fire fighters.
- It is very unlikely that any FAR Part airport in Arizona would find it "cost effective" to commit it's AIP or Discretionary Funds to an ARFF Training Facility.

B. Alternative Sites - The Committee was posed with the following question, If a Regional ARFF Training Facility were built in Arizona, which sites should be considered?

- Mr. Kenney provided a summary of the seven sites currently under consideration including: Evergreen Air Center, Holbrook, Kingman, Prescott, Tucson Public Safety Academy, Williams Gateway Airport and Yuma Marine Corps Station.

- The Committee filled out a quantitative evaluation matrix, prepared by Greiner, that addressed all seven sites within the context of 12 evaluation criteria.
 - The results of this evaluation are withheld until the investigation of other potential combined use sites have been further evaluated.
- C. Alternative Technologies - The Committee was posed with the following question: If a Regional ARFF Training Facility were built in the State of Arizona, should it be fueled with conventional fuels (e.g. jet fuel, JP-4, diesel) or with propane?
- Mr. Kenney provided an overview of the essential benefits and liabilities of both technologies.
 - After much discussion by the Committee members, it was unanimously decided that conventional fuels were the most desirable, particularly in connection with fuel spill and aircraft fuselage simulators. Propane simulators may be preferable in connection with aircraft component mockups (e.g. engines, wheels, APU's, etc.).
 - Essentially, the Committee agreed that fire fighters should "train like they fight."

V. Recommendations

Consultant - Greiner, Inc. provided the following recommendations:

- Evaluate the potential participation of other existing or planned fire training facilities located within the State of Arizona (e.g. Phoenix, Mesa).
- Develop a conceptual site plan and cost estimate for a "scaled back" ARFF training facility for inclusion into the Final Draft Report.
- Further investigate the feasibility of a smoke-suppression system for conventionally fuel systems.
- One additional meeting with the Committee Chairman and ADOT to discuss the contents of the Final Draft Report.

- Summarize in the Final Draft Report the following Committee recommendations:
 - Recommend that an ARFF training facility be built in the State of Arizona.
 - Recommend that the host site be one of the three highest ranking sites computed from the evaluation matrix.
 - Recommend that the ARFF training facility be incorporated with other existing/planned fire training facilities.
 - Recommend that the focal point of the facility (e.g. burn pit, fuel spill and aircraft mockup) be fueled with conventional fuels).
 - Recommended that aircraft components (e.g. engine, wheel/brake, interior space), mock ups be fueled with propane as an alternative.
- Suggest to ADOT that the conclusion of this study, the Consultant be authorized to 1) conduct preliminary discussions with the three highest-ranked sites to insure follow through by the "host" site and 2) conduct further coordination with FAA and ADOT to insure that funding is available and 3) obtain involvement of eventual facility users in the development of an ARFF.
- Committee - the ARFF Training Facility Committee restated the following:
 - Consider a site that involves both airport and non-airport fire fighters.
 - Include as much land as possible for future expansion.
 - Fully consider other non-airport users.
 - Consider a facility that includes conventional-fueled burn pit/mock up and propane fueled aircraft component simulators.
 - Although this is likely the last meeting of the full committee, it has not been disbanded and may be call upon for future consultation.
- Department - the ADOT Aeronautical Division suggested the following:
 - Follow up with contacting other potential host sites (e.g. Mesa, Phoenix), before final site ranking is determined.
 - Give full consideration to a host site that offers some existing support facilities in order to make the project more cost effective.
 - Re-evaluate the cost/effective analysis of a scaled-back facility.

VI. Final Draft Report

The Final Draft Report will be distributed to Committee members and the Department in about four weeks for review. A meeting will follow between the Consultant, the Department and Committee Chairman.

VII. Other Matters

During the course of this meeting, telephone calls were conducted between the Committee and (1) Mr. Robert Bloom, FAA and (2) Mr. Gary Adams, ADOT. Brief summaries of these conversations are attached.

End of meeting.

MK:ha

xc: Attendees

Telephone Conversation with Mr. Robert Bloom
FAA Southwest Region
8/4/95

- If an airport in Arizona does not wish to commit Entitlement Funds towards the construction of Regional ARFF Training Facility, then Discretionary Funds could be used.
- This would not likely affect Reliever Airport Set-Aside Funds.
- It is also possible that the funds could come from 2 "General Discretionary" Fund, and thereby not directly affect other State projects such as those included under Capacity and Safety Funding.
- If it can be adequately demonstrated that the benefactors of this facility are from outside the state of FAA region, it is possible that funding can be "cross-regional,"
- It is possible that a host site that is not an airport can apply for the funding.
- The funding for an ARFF training facility in the range of \$2-\$5 million is not unrealistic.

MK:ha

Telephone Conversation with Mr. Gary Adams
ADOT
8/4/95

- Recommendation made that other potential host sites be evaluated which could offer (1) training with non-airport fire fighters and (2) existing/planned support facilities (these may include Mesa, Tempe, and Phoenix).
- It is likely that the State contribution of 5 percent will off-set the expected 10 percent "local" contribution.

MK:ha